arXiv:1612.00724v1 [hep-ph] 2 Dec 2016

UWThPh-2016-27
CFTP/16-014

Charged-lepton decays from soft flavour violation

E. H. Aeikens,[(1)*] W. Grimus,[(1)§] and L. Lavoura[(2)¶]

[(1)] University of Vienna, Faculty of Physics, Boltzmanngasse 5, A–1090 Wien, Austria

[(2)] CFTP, Instituto Superior Técnico, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal

2 December 2016

Abstract

We consider a two-Higgs-doublet extension of the Standard Model, with three right-handed neutrino singlets and the seesaw mechanism, wherein all the Yukawa-coupling matrices are lepton flavour-diagonal and lepton flavour violation originates solely in the non-flavour-diagonal Majorana mass matrix of the right-handed neutrinos. We explicitly display a region in the parameter space of this model where the branching ratios of all five charged-lepton decays $\ell_1^- \to \ell_2^- \ell_3^+ \ell_3^-$ are close to their experimental upper bounds, while the radiative decays $\ell_1^- \to \ell_2^- \gamma$ are invisible because they are suppressed by m_R^{-4}, where m_R is the seesaw scale. We also consider the anomalous magnetic moment of the muon and show that in our model the contributions from the extra scalars can remove the discrepancy between its experimental and theoretical values.

*E-mail: elke.aeikens@univie.ac.at
§E-mail: walter.grimus@univie.ac.at
¶E-mail: balio@cftp.tecnico.ulisboa.pt

1 Introduction

In this paper we resume an old idea of two of us [1]: in a multi-Higgs-doublet model furnished with three right-handed neutrino singlets and the seesaw mechanism [2], lepton flavour may be conserved in the Yukawa couplings of all the Higgs doublets and violated solely in the Majorana mass terms of the right-handed neutrinos $\nu_{\ell R}$ ($\ell = e, \mu, \tau$), *viz.* in

$$\mathcal{L}_{\nu_R \,\mathrm{mass}} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell_1, \ell_2} \bar{\nu}_{\ell_1 R} \, (M_R)_{\ell_1 \ell_2} \, C \, \bar{\nu}^T_{\ell_2 R} + \mathrm{H.c.}, \tag{1}$$

where C is the charge-conjugation matrix in Dirac space and M_R is a non-singular symmetric matrix in flavour space. Since $\mathcal{L}_{\nu_R \,\mathrm{mass}}$ has dimension three, the violation of the individual lepton flavour numbers L_ℓ and of the total lepton number $L = L_e + L_\mu + L_\tau$ is *soft*. Thus, in our framework $\mathcal{L}_{\nu_R \,\mathrm{mass}}$ is responsible for

1. the smallness of the light-neutrino masses,
2. lepton mixing,
3. violation of L, and
4. violation of L_e, L_μ, and L_τ.

In this context, lepton flavour-violating processes were explicitly investigated at one-loop order in ref. [3] and the following property of our framework was discovered. Let m_R denote the seesaw scale—the scale of the square roots of the eigenvalues of $M_R M_R^*$—and n denote the number of Higgs doublets; it was found in ref. [3] that

i. the amplitudes of the lepton flavour-violating processes involving gauge bosons, like $\mu^- \to e^- \gamma$ and $Z^0 \to e^- \mu^+$, scale down as $1/m_R^2$ when $m_R \to \infty$;

ii. the amplitudes of the box diagrams for lepton flavour-violating processes like $\tau^- \to \mu^- \mu^- e^+$ and $\tau^- \to e^- e^- \mu^+$ also scale down as $1/m_R^2$ for a large seesaw scale;

iii. however, if $n \geq 2$, the amplitudes for lepton flavour-violating processes $\ell_1 \to \ell_2 \, (S_b^0)^*$, where $(S_b^0)^*$ is a virtual (off-mass shell) neutral scalar, approach a nonzero limit when $m_R \to \infty$. The non-decoupling of the seesaw scale in $\ell_1 \to \ell_2 \, (S_b^0)^*$ is an effect of the one-loop diagrams with neutrinos and charged scalars in the loop.

As a consequence, in our framework the amplitude of the process $\mu^- \to e^- e^+ e^-$, which derives from $\mu^- \to e^- \, (S_b^0)^*$ followed by $(S_b^0)^* \to e^+ e^-$, just as the amplitudes of the four τ^- decays of the same type, are *unsuppressed* in the limit $m_R \to \infty$.

Let us estimate a lower bound on m_R by using the experimental bounds, given in table 1,[1] on the radiative decays $\ell_1 \to \ell_2 \gamma$. The amplitude for any such decay has the

[1] Two new experiments are planned in search for lepton flavour-violation at the Paul-Scherrer Institute. The MEG II experiment [6] plans a sensitivity improvement of one order of magnitude for $\mu^+ \to e^+ \gamma$. The $Mu3e$ experiment [7], which is in the stage of construction, aims at a sensitivity for $\mathrm{BR}\,(\mu^+ \to e^+ e^- e^+)$ of order 10^{-16}.

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
\mathrm{BR}\left(\mu^+ \to e^+\gamma\right) & < & 4.2 \times 10^{-13} \\
\mathrm{BR}\left(\tau^- \to e^-\gamma\right) & < & 3.3 \times 10^{-8} \\
\mathrm{BR}\left(\tau^- \to \mu^-\gamma\right) & < & 4.4 \times 10^{-8} \\
\mathrm{BR}\left(\mu^- \to e^-e^+e^-\right) & < & 1.0 \times 10^{-12} \\
\mathrm{BR}\left(\tau^- \to e^-e^+e^-\right) & < & 2.7 \times 10^{-8} \\
\mathrm{BR}\left(\tau^- \to e^-\mu^+\mu^-\right) & < & 2.7 \times 10^{-8} \\
\mathrm{BR}\left(\tau^- \to \mu^-\mu^+\mu^-\right) & < & 2.1 \times 10^{-8} \\
\mathrm{BR}\left(\tau^- \to \mu^-e^+e^-\right) & < & 1.8 \times 10^{-8}
\end{array}$$

Table 1: The experimental bounds on the branching ratios of some lepton flavour-changing decays. All the bounds are at the 90% CL. The first bound is from ref. [4], all the other bounds are from ref. [5].

form

$$\mathcal{A}\left(\ell_1^\pm \to \ell_2^\pm\gamma\right) = e\varepsilon_\rho^*\,\bar{u}_2\left(i\sigma^{\rho\lambda}q_\lambda\right)\left(A_L\gamma_L + A_R\gamma_R\right)u_1, \tag{2}$$

where ε_ρ is the polarization vector of the photon, u_1 and u_2 are the spinors of $\ell_1^\pm$ and $\ell_2^\pm$, respectively, and γ_L and γ_R are the projectors of chirality. The decay rate is given, in the limit $m_{\ell_2} = 0$, by

$$\Gamma\left(\ell_1^\pm \to \ell_2^\pm\gamma\right) = \frac{\alpha m_{\ell_1}^3}{4}\left(|A_L|^2 + |A_R|^2\right). \tag{3}$$

Knowing that A_L and A_R are suppressed by m_R^{-2}, one may estimate, just on dimensional grounds, that

$$A_{L,R} \sim \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\,\frac{m_{\ell_1}}{m_R^2}. \tag{4}$$

Using the first two bounds of table 1 together with the experimental values for the masses and widths of the μ and τ, one may then derive the lower bounds $m_R \gtrsim 50\,\mathrm{TeV}$ from $\mu^+ \to e^+\gamma$ and $m_R \gtrsim 2\,\mathrm{TeV}$ from $\tau^- \to e^-\gamma$.

Thus, in the framework of ref. [3], if we take $m_R \gtrsim 500\,\mathrm{TeV}$ then the radiative decays $\ell_1 \to \ell_2\gamma$ are invisible in the foreseeable future. On the other hand, because of the nonzero limit of the amplitudes for $\ell_1 \to \ell_2\,(S_b^0)^*$, the charged-lepton decays $\ell_1 \to \ell_2\ell_3^+\ell_3^-$ are unsuppressed when $m_R \to \infty$. It is the purpose of this paper to investigate those decays numerically in the framework of ref. [3], assuming m_R to be so large that the radiative charged-lepton decays are invisible. Then, m_R is also much larger than the masses of the scalars in the model, which we assume to be in between one and a few TeV.

As a sideline, in this paper we also consider the scalar contributions to the anomalous magnetic moment a_ℓ of the charged lepton ℓ, with particular emphasis on a_μ.

In order to keep the number of parameters of the model at a minimum, we restrict ourselves to just two Higgs doublets. Anticipating our results, we find that *all* five decays $\ell_1 \to \ell_2\ell_3^+\ell_3^-$ may well be just around the corner, while at the same time the contributions of the non-Standard Model (SM) scalars of the model can make up for the discrepancy $a_\mu^{\mathrm{exp}} - a_\mu^{\mathrm{SM}}$ of the anomalous magnetic moment of the muon.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we recall some results of ref. [3]. We then specialize to the case of just two Higgs doublets in section 3. We present the formulas

for the contribution of the non-SM scalars to a_ℓ in section 4. Section 5 is devoted to a numerical simulation. In section 6 we summarize and conclude.

2 The lepton flavour-violating decays $\ell_1^- \to \ell_2^- \ell_3^+ \ell_3^-$

2.1 The effective lepton flavour-violating interaction

The framework of ref. [3] assumes an n-Higgs-doublet setup wherein the violation of the family lepton numbers L_ℓ is soft. The corresponding Yukawa Lagrangian has the form

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Yukawa}} = -\sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{\ell=e,\mu,\tau} \left[\phi_k^\dagger \, \bar{\ell}_R \, (\Gamma_k)_{\ell\ell} + \tilde{\phi}_k^\dagger \, \bar{\nu}_{\ell R} \, (\Delta_k)_{\ell\ell} \right] D_{\ell L} + \text{H.c.} \tag{5}$$

The basic assumption is

$$\Gamma_k \text{ and } \Delta_k \text{ diagonal, } \forall \, k = 1, \ldots, n, \tag{6}$$

as is already implicit in equation (5). In that equation, the Higgs doublets and the left-handed-lepton gauge doublets are given by

$$\phi_k = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_k^+ \\ \varphi_k^0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\phi}_k = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_k^{0\,*} \\ -\varphi_k^- \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad D_{\ell L} = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_{\ell L} \\ \ell_L \end{pmatrix}, \tag{7}$$

respectively.

The scalar mass eigenfields S_a^+ and S_b^0 are related to the φ_k^+ and φ_k^0 by

$$\varphi_k^+ = \sum_{a=1}^{n} U_{ka} S_a^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_k^0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(v_k + \sum_{b=1}^{2n} V_{kb} S_b^0 \right), \tag{8}$$

respectively [8]. The vacuum expectation values (VEVs) are $v_k \,/\sqrt{2}$. The unitary $n \times n$ matrix U diagonalizes the Hermitian mass matrix of the charged scalars. The $2n \times 2n$ real orthogonal matrix $\tilde{V}$, which diagonalizes the mass matrix of neutral scalar fields, is written as [8]

$$\tilde{V} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}\, V \\ \text{Im}\, V \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad V \equiv \text{Re}\, V + i \, \text{Im}\, V. \tag{9}$$

We number the scalar mass eigenfields in such a way that $S_1^\pm = G^\pm$ and $S_1^0 = G^0$ are the Goldstone bosons. If there is only one Higgs doublet, *i.e.* when $n = 1$, the matrix V is simply $V = (i, \ 1)$ in the phase convention where $v_1 > 0$, and S_2^0 is the Higgs field of the SM.

We define the diagonal matrices

$$M_D = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{v_k}{\sqrt{2}} \, \Delta_k, \quad M_\ell = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{v_k^*}{\sqrt{2}} \, \Gamma_k = \text{diag}\, (m_e, m_\mu, m_\tau) \, . \tag{10}$$

According to ref. [3], in the limit $m_R \to \infty$, where m_R is the seesaw scale, the flavour-changing interactions of the physical neutral scalars S_b^0, induced by loops with charged scalars and neutrinos, are given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}\left(S^0\right) = \sum_{b\geq 2} S_b^0 \sum_{\ell_1 \neq \ell_2} \bar{\ell}_1 \left[\left(A_L^b\right)_{\ell_1\ell_2} \gamma_L + \left(A_R^b\right)_{\ell_1\ell_2} \gamma_R\right] \ell_2. \tag{11}$$

Note that the summation over b begins with $b = 2$, *i.e.* it excludes the Goldstone boson S_1^0. The coefficients $\left(A_{L,R}^b\right)_{\ell_1\ell_2}$ were computed in ref. [3]. Let us define the 3×3 unitary matrix U_R that diagonalizes M_R as

$$U_R^\dagger M_R U_R^* = \text{diag}\left(m_4, m_5, m_6\right), \tag{12}$$

where $m_{4.5.6}$ are, in the limit $m_R \to \infty$, the masses of the heavy neutrinos. We next define

$$X_{\ell_1\ell_2} \equiv \frac{1}{16\sqrt{2}\pi^2} \sum_{i=4}^{6} \left[\left(U_R\right)_{\ell_1 i} \left(U_R^*\right)_{\ell_2 i} \ln \frac{m_i^2}{\mu^2}\right] = X_{\ell_2\ell_1}^*, \tag{13}$$

where μ is a mass scale which is arbitrary because of the unitarity of U_R. Finally, we define the flavour space matrices $A_{1,2,3}$ as

$$\left(A_1\right)_{\ell_1\ell_2} \equiv \sum_{k'=1}^{n} \left(\Gamma_{k'}\right)_{\ell_1\ell_1} \left(\Delta_{k'}\right)_{\ell_2\ell_2}, \tag{14a}$$

$$\left(A_2\right)_{\ell_1\ell_2} \equiv \sum_{k'=1}^{n} \left(\Delta_{k'}^*\right)_{\ell_1\ell_1} \left(\Delta_{k'}\right)_{\ell_2\ell_2}, \tag{14b}$$

$$\left(A_3\right)_{\ell_1\ell_2} \equiv \sum_{k'=1}^{n} \left(\Delta_{k'}^*\right)_{\ell_1\ell_1} \left(\Gamma_{k'}^*\right)_{\ell_2\ell_2}. \tag{14c}$$

Notice that $A_3 = A_1^\dagger$ and $A_2 = A_2^\dagger$. Then,

$$\left(A_L^b\right)_{\ell_1\ell_2} = \frac{X_{\ell_1\ell_2} A_{\ell_1\ell_2}^b}{m_{\ell_1}^2 - m_{\ell_2}^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \left(A_R^b\right)_{\ell_1\ell_2} = \frac{X_{\ell_2\ell_1}^* \left(A_{\ell_2\ell_1}^b\right)^*}{m_{\ell_2}^2 - m_{\ell_1}^2}, \tag{15}$$

where m_{ℓ_i} is the mass of the charged lepton ℓ_i and

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\ell_1\ell_2}^b = & \sum_{k=1}^{n} V_{kb}^* \left\{\left(\Delta_k^*\right)_{\ell_1\ell_1} \left(m_{\ell_1}^2 - m_{\ell_2}^2\right) \left(A_1\right)_{\ell_1\ell_2} \right. \\ & + \left(\Gamma_k\right)_{\ell_1\ell_1} \left[-m_{\ell_1} \left(M_D^*\right)_{\ell_1\ell_1} \left(A_1\right)_{\ell_1\ell_2} + \frac{m_{\ell_2}^2}{2} \left(A_2\right)_{\ell_1\ell_2} - m_{\ell_2} \left(M_D\right)_{\ell_2\ell_2} \left(A_3\right)_{\ell_1\ell_2}\right] \\ & \left. + \left(\Gamma_k\right)_{\ell_2\ell_2} \left[m_{\ell_2} \left(M_D^*\right)_{\ell_1\ell_1} \left(A_1\right)_{\ell_1\ell_2} - \frac{m_{\ell_1} m_{\ell_2}}{2} \left(A_2\right)_{\ell_1\ell_2} + m_{\ell_1} \left(M_D\right)_{\ell_2\ell_2} \left(A_3\right)_{\ell_1\ell_2}\right]\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

We note that, in every multi-Higgs-doublet model, it is possible to choose a basis for the scalar doublets such that only one of them, say ϕ_1, has nonzero VEV:

$$\left\langle \varphi_1^0 \right\rangle_0 = \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \left\langle \varphi_k^0 \right\rangle_0 = 0, \ \forall\ k > 1. \tag{17}$$

This basis is called the 'Higgs basis'. In it, from equation (10),

$$(\Delta_1^*)_{\ell_1\ell_1} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{v^*}\,(M_D^*)_{\ell_1\ell_1}\,, \quad (\Gamma_1)_{\ell_1\ell_1} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{v^*}\,m_{\ell_1}. \tag{18}$$

With equations (18) one finds that, in the sum over k in equation (16), the term with $k = 1$ gives a null contribution. Thus, *in the Higgs basis, the contribution to* $A^b_{\ell_1\ell_2}$ *proportional to* V^*_{1b} *is identically zero.* In particular, if there is only one Higgs doublet, *i.e.* in the SM, $A^b_{\ell_1\ell_2} = 0$, *viz.* when $n = 1$ there are no effective lepton flavour-violating interactions of the neutral scalar in the limit $m_R \to \infty$.

2.2 The decay rate

If $\ell_2 \neq \ell_3$, then $\ell_1^- \to \ell_2^-\ell_3^+\ell_3^-$ may be either $\tau^- \to \mu^- e^+ e^-$ or $\tau^- \to e^-\mu^+\mu^-$. Equation (11) supplies the amplitude of the subprocess $\ell_1^- \to \ell_2^-\,(S_b^0)^*$. For the subsequent $(S_b^0)^* \to \ell_3^+\ell_3^-$ we have

$$\mathcal{L}^{(\ell^\pm)}_{\text{Yukawa}}\left(S^0\right) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sum_{b=2}^{2n} S_b^0 \sum_{\ell=e,\mu\tau}\bar{\ell}\left[\left(\hat{\Gamma}_b\right)_{\ell\ell}\gamma_L + \left(\hat{\Gamma}_b^\dagger\right)_{\ell\ell}\gamma_R\right]\ell, \tag{19}$$

where

$$\hat{\Gamma}_b \equiv \sum_{k=1}^{n} V^*_{kb}\Gamma_k. \tag{20}$$

We write the decay amplitude for $\ell_1^- \to \ell_2^-\ell_3^+\ell_3^-$ as

$$\mathcal{A} = \sum_{b=2}^{2n}\bar{u}_2\left[(\lambda_b)_{\ell_2\ell_1}\gamma_L + (\rho_b)_{\ell_2\ell_1}\gamma_R\right]u_1\,\bar{u}_3\left[\left(\hat{\Gamma}_b\right)_{\ell_3\ell_3}\gamma_L + \left(\hat{\Gamma}_b^\dagger\right)_{\ell_3\ell_3}\gamma_R\right]v_3, \tag{21}$$

where, from equations (11) and (19),

$$(\lambda_b)_{\ell_2\ell_1} = -\frac{\left(A_L^b\right)_{\ell_2\ell_1}}{\sqrt{2}\,M_b^2} \quad \text{and} \quad (\rho_b)_{\ell_2\ell_1} = -\frac{\left(A_R^b\right)_{\ell_2\ell_1}}{\sqrt{2}\,M_b^2}. \tag{22}$$

In equations (22), M_b is the mass of S_b^0. In the scalar propagators, we have neglected the four-momentum of the $\ell_3^+\ell_3^-$ subsystem. With the amplitude in equation (21), the decay rate is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma\left(\ell_1^- \to \ell_2^-\ell_3^+\ell_3^-\right) \;=\; & \frac{m_{\ell_1}^5}{6144\pi^3}\left[\left|\sum_{b=2}^{2n}(\lambda_b)_{\ell_2\ell_1}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_b\right)_{\ell_3\ell_3}\right|^2 + \left|\sum_{b=2}^{2n}(\lambda_b)_{\ell_2\ell_1}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_b^*\right)_{\ell_3\ell_3}\right|^2\right. \\ & \left. + \left|\sum_{b=2}^{2n}(\rho_b)_{\ell_2\ell_1}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_b\right)_{\ell_3\ell_3}\right|^2 + \left|\sum_{b=2}^{2n}(\rho_b)_{\ell_2\ell_1}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_b^*\right)_{\ell_3\ell_3}\right|^2\right].\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

We have neglected the masses of the final charged leptons in the kinematics.

If $\ell_2 = \ell_3$, then $\ell_1^- \to \ell_2^- \ell_2^+ \ell_2^-$ may be either $\mu^- \to e^- e^+ e^-$ or $\tau^- \to e^- e^+ e^-$ or $\tau^- \to \mu^- \mu^+ \mu^-$. In equation (21) one must antisymmetrize the amplitude with respect to ℓ_2^- and in the kinematics one must insert an extra factor 1/2. The final result is

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma\left(\ell_1^- \to \ell_2^- \ell_2^+ \ell_2^-\right) &= \frac{m_{\ell_1}^5}{6144\pi^3}\left[\frac{1}{2}\left|\sum_{b=2}^{2n}(\lambda_b)_{\ell_2\ell_1}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_b\right)_{\ell_2\ell_2}\right|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\left|\sum_{b=2}^{2n}(\rho_b)_{\ell_2\ell_1}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_b^*\right)_{\ell_2\ell_2}\right|^2\right. \\ &\left. + \left|\sum_{b=2}^{2n}(\lambda_b)_{\ell_2\ell_1}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_b^*\right)_{\ell_2\ell_2}\right|^2 + \left|\sum_{b=2}^{2n}(\rho_b)_{\ell_2\ell_1}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_b\right)_{\ell_2\ell_2}\right|^2\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

3 Two Higgs doublets

From now on we assume $n = 2$, *i.e.* a two-Higgs-doublet model. In the Higgs basis, the VEVs are given by

$$\left\langle\varphi_1^0\right\rangle_0 = \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \left\langle\varphi_2^0\right\rangle_0 = 0, \tag{25}$$

where $v \approx 246\,\text{GeV}$ is real and positive. Thus, according to equation (8),

$$\varphi_k^0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\delta_{k1}v + \sum_{b=1}^{4} V_{kb}S_b^0\right). \tag{26}$$

Moreover, the matrix U is the 2×2 unit matrix, *i.e.* $\varphi_1^+ = S_1^+ = G^+$ is the charged Goldstone boson and $\varphi_2^+ = S_2^+$ is the physical charged scalar. According to the notation of ref. [8], the 4×4 orthogonal matrix $\tilde{V}$ of equation (9), which diagonalizes the mass matrix of neutral scalar fields, is given by

$$\tilde{V} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & R_{11} & R_{12} & R_{13} \\ 0 & R_{21} & R_{22} & R_{23} \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & R_{31} & R_{32} & R_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \textit{i.e. } V = \begin{pmatrix} i & R_{11} & R_{12} & R_{13} \\ 0 & R_{21}+iR_{31} & R_{22}+iR_{32} & R_{23}+iR_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{27}$$

with a 3×3 orthogonal matrix R. The third row of $\tilde{V}$ corresponds to the neutral Goldstone boson $S_1^0 = G^0$. The definition (20) reads

$$\hat{\Gamma}_b = \Gamma_1 R_{1\,b-1} + \Gamma_2\left(R_{2\,b-1} - iR_{3\,b-1}\right) \tag{28}$$

for $b = 2, 3, 4$. We parameterize the flavour-diagonal Yukawa coupling matrices as

$$\Gamma_1 = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{v}\,\text{diag}\left(m_e, m_\mu, m_\tau\right) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{v}\,M_\ell, \tag{29a}$$

$$\Gamma_2 = \text{diag}\left(\gamma_e, \gamma_\mu, \gamma_\tau\right), \tag{29b}$$

$$\Delta_1 = \text{diag}\left(d_e, d_\mu, d_\tau\right) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{v}\,M_D, \tag{29c}$$

$$\Delta_2 = \text{diag}\left(\delta_e, \delta_\mu, \delta_\tau\right). \tag{29d}$$

Therefore, from equations (14) and (16),

$$A^b_{\ell_1\ell_2} = V^*_{2b}\, A_{\ell_1\ell_2}, \tag{30a}$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\ell_1\ell_2} = {} & \frac{\sqrt{2}\left(m^2_{\ell_1} - m^2_{\ell_2}\right) m_{\ell_1} \delta^*_{\ell_1} d_{\ell_2}}{v} \\ & - \left(m^2_{\ell_1} + \frac{m^2_{\ell_2}}{2}\right) \gamma_{\ell_1} d^*_{\ell_1} d_{\ell_2} + \frac{3 m_{\ell_1} m_{\ell_2}}{2}\, d^*_{\ell_1} \gamma_{\ell_2} d_{\ell_2} \\ & + \left(m^2_{\ell_1} - \frac{m^2_{\ell_2}}{2}\right) \gamma_{\ell_1} \delta^*_{\ell_1} \delta_{\ell_2} - \frac{m_{\ell_1} m_{\ell_2}}{2}\, \delta^*_{\ell_1} \gamma_{\ell_2} \delta_{\ell_2} \\ & + \frac{v m_{\ell_2}}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\gamma_{\ell_1} d^*_{\ell_1} \gamma_{\ell_2} \delta_{\ell_2} - \gamma_{\ell_1} \delta^*_{\ell_1} \gamma^*_{\ell_2} d_{\ell_2}\right) + \frac{v m_{\ell_1}}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\delta^*_{\ell_1} \left|\gamma_{\ell_2}\right|^2 d_{\ell_2} - \gamma^2_{\ell_1} d^*_{\ell_1} \delta_{\ell_2}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{30b}$$

As demonstrated at the end of section 2.1, in $A^b_{\ell_1\ell_2}$ the term proportional to V^*_{1b} vanishes.

We now make the further assumption that ϕ_1 is just identical with the Higgs doublet of the SM; this means that S^0_2 is exactly like the SM Higgs boson. This choice relieves us from having to take into account the experimental restrictions on the couplings of the SM Higgs boson, which become automatically fulfilled. We now have

$$\phi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} S^+_1 \\ \left(v + S^0_2 + i S^0_1\right)/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{31}$$

where $S^+_1 = G^+$ and $S^0_1 = G^0$ are the Goldstone bosons. This means that we choose $R_{11} = 1$, whence it follows that R can be written as[2]

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos\alpha & \sin\alpha \\ 0 & -\sin\alpha & \cos\alpha \end{pmatrix}. \tag{32}$$

The matrix V is

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} i & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{-i\alpha} & i e^{-i\alpha} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{33}$$

Thus, from equation (26),

$$\phi_2 = \begin{pmatrix} S^+_2 \\ e^{-i\alpha}\left(S^0_3 + i S^0_4\right)/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{34}$$

From equation (28),

$$\hat{\Gamma}_2 = \Gamma_1, \quad \hat{\Gamma}_3 = e^{i\alpha}\Gamma_2, \quad \hat{\Gamma}_4 = -i e^{i\alpha}\Gamma_2, \tag{35}$$

and, from equation (30a),

$$A^2_{\ell_1\ell_2} = 0, \quad A^3_{\ell_1\ell_2} = e^{i\alpha} A_{\ell_1\ell_2}, \quad A^4_{\ell_1\ell_2} = -i e^{i\alpha} A_{\ell_1\ell_2}. \tag{36}$$

The decay rates are then

$$\Gamma\left(\ell^-_1 \to \ell^-_2 \ell^+_3 \ell^-_3\right) = \frac{m^5_{\ell_1}}{6144\pi^3} \left|X_{\ell_2\ell_1}\right|^2 \left|\gamma_{\ell_3}\right|^2 \frac{\left|A_{\ell_2\ell_1}\right|^2 + \left|A_{\ell_1\ell_2}\right|^2}{\left(m^2_{\ell_2} - m^2_{\ell_1}\right)^2} \left(\frac{1}{M^4_3} + \frac{1}{M^4_4}\right), \tag{37a}$$

[2]We assume without loss of generality that the orthogonal matrix R has determinant $+1$.

$$\Gamma\left(\ell_1^- \to \ell_2^- \ell_2^+ \ell_2^-\right) = \frac{m_{\ell_1}^5}{6144\pi^3} \left|X_{\ell_2\ell_1}\right|^2 \left|\gamma_{\ell_2}\right|^2 \frac{\left|A_{\ell_2\ell_1}\right|^2 + \left|A_{\ell_1\ell_2}\right|^2}{\left(m_{\ell_2}^2 - m_{\ell_1}^2\right)^2} \times \left[\frac{3}{4}\left(\frac{1}{M_3^4} + \frac{1}{M_4^4}\right) + \frac{1}{2M_3^2 M_4^2}\right]. \quad (37b)$$

The decay rates depend on the masses M_3 and M_4 of the non-SM neutral scalar fields S_3^0 and S_4^0, respectively. There is no dependence on the phase α. In equation (37a), $\ell_2 \neq \ell_3$ is understood.

4 The anomalous magnetic moment of the muon

Let $a_\ell^{(S)}$ denote the contributions of the non-SM scalars S_3^0, S_4^0, and $S_2^\pm$ to the anomalous magnetic moment (AMM) of the charged lepton ℓ. To a good approximation,

$$a_\ell^{(S)} \simeq \frac{m_\ell^2}{96\pi^2}\left\{2\left|\gamma_\ell\right|^2\left(\frac{1}{M_3^2} + \frac{1}{M_4^2}\right)\right. \quad (38a)$$

$$-3\,\mathrm{Re}\left(e^{2i\alpha}\gamma_\ell^2\right)\left[\frac{1}{M_3^2}\left(3 + 2\ln\frac{m_\ell^2}{M_3^2}\right) - \frac{1}{M_4^2}\left(3 + 2\ln\frac{m_\ell^2}{M_4^2}\right)\right] \quad (38b)$$

$$\left. -\frac{\left|\gamma_\ell\right|^2}{\mu_2^2}\right\}. \quad (38c)$$

Lines (38a) and (38b) derive from a loop with ℓ and either S_3^0 or S_4^0; the photon line attaches to ℓ. Line (38c) comes from a loop with $S_2^\pm$ and light neutrinos, wherein the external photon attaches to $S_2^\pm$; in that line, μ_2 denotes the mass of $S_2^\pm$. We have dropped all the terms proportional to m_R^{-2}, including in particular the contributions from the loop with $S_2^\pm$ and heavy neutrinos. For the coupling of the charged scalars to the charged leptons we refer the reader to ref. [3].

There is a long-standing discrepancy between the experimental value of the AMM of the muon, a_μ^{exp}, and the SM theoretical value of that AMM, a_μ^{SM} [9]:[3]

$$a_\mu^{\mathrm{exp}} - a_\mu^{\mathrm{SM}} = \begin{cases} (287 \pm 80) \times 10^{-11} \text{ (at } 3.6\sigma\text{) [11]}, \\ (261 \pm 78) \times 10^{-11} \text{ (at } 3.3\sigma\text{) [12]}. \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

If this discrepancy signals new physics, then the contributions of the scalars in our model to the AMM of the muon may be relevant. Taking for instance γ_μ^2 real and $e^{2i\alpha} = 1$, one has

$$a_\mu^{(S)} \simeq -\frac{\gamma_\mu^2}{96\pi^2}\left[\frac{m_\mu^2}{M_3^2}\left(7 + 6\ln\frac{m_\mu^2}{M_3^2}\right) - \frac{m_\mu^2}{M_4^2}\left(11 + 6\ln\frac{m_\mu^2}{M_4^2}\right) + \frac{m_\mu^2}{\mu_2^2}\right]. \quad (40)$$

The right-hand side of equation (40) is dominated by the two terms with logarithms. One readily sees that the terms with M_4 and μ_2 give negative contributions to $a_\mu^{(S)}$ (assuming γ_μ^2 to be positive), while the term with M_3 gives a positive contribution; since $a_\mu^{\mathrm{exp}} - a_\mu^{\mathrm{SM}}$ is positive, we would like the third term to dominate over the other two; this is achieved

[3] See also ref. [10] for a recent review.

in $M_3 < M_4$. Taking for instance $M_3 = 1\,\text{TeV}$, $M_4 = \mu_2 = 2\,\text{TeV}$, and $\gamma_\mu^2 = 1.7$, we find $a_\mu^{(S)} = 258 \times 10^{-11}$, which is of the right sign and absolute value to explain the discrepancy (39). We conclude that our model can, using reasonable parameters, fill the gap between a_μ^{exp} and a_μ^{SM}.[4]

The experimental AMM of the electron is in good agreement with the SM prediction for a_e. We must therefore check that the non-SM scalars of our model give an $a_e^{(S)}$ smaller than the experimental error 2.6×10^{-13} [5] of a_e. We might of course simply take $\gamma_e = 0$, but this would eliminate the decay $\mu^- \to e^- e^+ e^-$, which we would like to have close to its experimental upper limit. So we use instead the same scalar masses as before and choose $\gamma_e = 1.7$, obtaining $a_e^{(S)} = 1.0 \times 10^{-13}$. Thus, even for a relatively large γ_e, $a_e^{(S)}$ can be below the experimental error. This is of course because of the tiny electron mass.

5 Numerics

In this section, we want to show that in the two-Higgs-doublet version of the framework of ref. [3], and assuming moreover $R_{11} = 1$, *it is possible to choose all the parameters such that the branching ratios of all five decays* $\ell_1^- \to \ell_2^- \ell_3^+ \ell_3^-$ *turn out close to their present experimental upper bounds* displayed in table 1.

Notice that we only strive in this section to prove that something is *possible*; we do *not* attempt a scan of the parameter space of our model and, indeed, we shall make many simplifying assumptions. In particular, we shall assume that all the parameters of the model are *real*. Thus, to start with, we shall assume that all the couplings in Γ_2, Δ_1, and Δ_2 are real.

In order to compute the factors $X_{\ell_1 \ell_2}$ of equation (13), we proceed in the following way. The mass matrix of the light neutrinos is obtained by the seesaw formula. In our notation, it reads

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu = -M_D^T M_R^{-1} M_D = -\frac{v^2}{2}\,\Delta_1 M_R^{-1} \Delta_1, \tag{41}$$

where $\Delta_1 = \text{diag}\,(d_e, d_\mu, d_\tau)$ is diagonal. Inverting equation (41), we obtain

$$M_R = -\frac{v^2}{2}\,\Delta_1 \mathcal{M}_\nu^{-1} \Delta_1. \tag{42}$$

The matrix $\mathcal{M}_\nu$ is diagonalized as

$$V_L^T \mathcal{M}_\nu V_L = \text{diag}\,(m_1, m_2, m_3) \equiv \hat{m}, \tag{43}$$

where $m_{1,2,3}$ are the light-neutrino masses and $V_L = e^{i\hat{\alpha}}\, U_{\text{PMNS}}\, e^{i\hat{\beta}}$ is identical to the lepton mixing matrix U_{PMNS}, apart from a diagonal matrix of unphysical phases $e^{i\hat{\alpha}}$ on the left

[4] Our choice $M_4 = \mu_2$ has the advantage that it automatically leads to a zero oblique parameter T. Indeed, in our two-Higgs-doublet model with $R_{11} = 1$,

$$T = \frac{1}{16\pi s_w^2 m_W^2}\left[f\left(M_3^2, \mu_2^2\right) + f\left(M_4^2, \mu_2^2\right) - f\left(M_3^2, M_4^2\right)\right],$$

where $f\,(x, y)$ is a function [8, 13] that is zero when $x = y$. From this, $T = 0$ follows for $M_4 = \mu_2$.

and apart from the Majorana phase factors of the diagonal matrix $e^{i\hat{\beta}}$ on the right. Using equations (42) and (43) together with the fact that the matrices Δ_1, $\hat{m}$, $e^{i\hat{\alpha}}$, and $e^{i\hat{\beta}}$ are diagonal, we obtain

$$M_R = -\frac{v^2}{2}\, e^{i\hat{\alpha}} \Delta_1\, U_{\text{PMNS}} \left(e^{2i\hat{\beta}} \hat{m}^{-1}\right) U_{\text{PMNS}}^T\, \Delta_1 e^{i\hat{\alpha}}. \tag{44}$$

Following our simplifying assumption that all the parameters in the model are real, we set in equation (44) $e^{i\hat{\alpha}} = e^{i\hat{\beta}} = \mathbb{1}$ and we also assume that U_{PMNS} is real, *i.e.* that the Dirac phase δ is either 0 or π. Besides assuming $e^{i\delta} = \pm 1$, in U_{PMNS} we fix $s_{12}^2 = 0.304$, $s_{23}^2 = 0.452$, and $s_{13}^2 = 0.0218$ at their best-fit values of ref. [14]. We also have to choose the type of light-neutrino mass spectrum, either normal or inverted—for definiteness, we settle on a normal mass spectrum. We leave the lightest neutrino mass m_1, which is unknown to date, as a free parameter; with a choice for m_1 and the best-fit values $\Delta m_{21}^2 = 7.50 \times 10^{-5}\,\text{eV}^2$, $\Delta m_{31}^2 = 2.457 \times 10^{-3}\,\text{eV}^2$ of ref. [14], we compute

$$m_2 = \sqrt{m_1^2 + \Delta m_{21}^2} \quad \text{and} \quad m_3 = \sqrt{m_1^2 + \Delta m_{31}^2}. \tag{45}$$

Thus, while leaving free only the value of m_1 and $e^{i\delta} = \pm 1$, we are able to compute M_R through equation (44); therefrom we compute the quantities $X_{\ell_1\ell_2}$ by using equations (12) and (13).

In this section we also want to fit $a_\mu^{\text{exp}} - a_\mu^{\text{SM}}$ of equation (39) by using $a_\mu^{(S)}$ of equation (38); in that equation there are the neutral-scalar masses M_3 and M_4, the charged-scalar mass μ_2, the coupling constant γ_μ, and the phase α. In order to simplify our task, we will fix all those parameters at the values used in section 4.

We are still free to vary m_1, the d_ℓ and δ_ℓ for $\ell = e, \mu, \tau$, and γ_e and γ_τ. A possible complete set of values for the parameters occurring in the decay rates of equations (37), including those fixed already in section 4, is

$$\begin{aligned}
&M_3 = 1\,\text{TeV},\ M_4 = 2\,\text{TeV},\\
&m_1 = 0.05\,\text{eV},\\
&\gamma_e = \gamma_\mu = \gamma_\tau = 1.7,\\
&d_e = 0.6,\ d_\mu = d_\tau = 0.1,\\
&\delta_e = 0,\ \delta_\mu = 7 \times 10^{-5},\ \delta_\tau = 0.2.
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

The branching ratios derived from equations (46) are shown in table 2. One sees that all the branching ratios in that table are less than a factor of two away from the upper bounds of table 1. We have thus demonstrated that in our model it is possible to suppress the radiative decays of the muon and tau lepton, while keeping the branching ratios of their decays into charged leptons very close to the experimental upper bounds.

Some remarks concerning the input values of equations (46) are in order:

- All the experimental upper bounds on the branching ratios of the decays of the tau lepton are quite similar. Therefore, if we want to have both $\tau^- \to \ell^- e^+ e^-$ and $\tau^- \to \ell^- \mu^+ \mu^-$ close to their experimental upper bounds, then γ_e and γ_μ will have to be similar—see the explicit factors γ_{ℓ_3} and γ_{ℓ_2} in the decay rates of equations (37a) and (37b), respectively. For definiteness we have chosen all three γ_ℓ to be the same.

BR	$\cos\delta = +1$	$\cos\delta = -1$
$\mu^- \to e^- e^+ e^-$	7.467×10^{-13}	3.872×10^{-13}
$\tau^- \to e^- e^+ e^-$	6.473×10^{-9}	1.111×10^{-8}
$\tau^- \to e^- \mu^+ \mu^-$	7.461×10^{-9}	1.280×10^{-8}
$\tau^- \to \mu^- \mu^+ \mu^-$	1.304×10^{-8}	1.307×10^{-8}
$\tau^- \to \mu^- e^+ e^-$	1.503×10^{-8}	1.506×10^{-8}

Table 2: Branching ratios computed by using the input data of equations (46). We have chosen a normal ordering of the light-neutrino masses. For the mixing angles of the lepton mixing matrix and for the neutrino mass-squared differences we have used the best-fit values in table 2 of ref. [14]. The branching ratios have been computed for the values 0 and π of the CKM-type phase δ in the lepton mixing matrix.

- In $A_{\ell_1\ell_2}$ there are, in the last line of equation (30b), terms which have $v \simeq 246\,\text{GeV}$ in the numerator. These terms would give a large contribution to $\text{BR}\,(\mu^- \to e^- e^+ e^-)$ for parameters not very far from one. For this reason, we have needed very small input values for δ_e and δ_μ. For definiteness, we have taken $\delta_e = 0$.

- On the other hand, in the decays of the tau lepton the terms with v in the numerator are just the relevant ones and we have needed, once $\delta_e = 0$ and δ_μ was tiny, large parameters δ_τ, d_e, d_μ, and γ_ℓ ($\ell = e, \mu, \tau$).

We may thus say that the branching ratios of table 2 involve some finetuning.

With the input values of equations (46), we obtain heavy-neutrino masses $m_4 = 4.3 \times 10^{12}\,\text{GeV}$, $m_5 = 6.0 \times 10^{12}\,\text{GeV}$, and $m_6 = 2.2 \times 10^{14}\,\text{GeV}$ for both values of $\cos\delta$.[5] These masses represent the seesaw scale, which is so large that all the radiative charged-lepton decays are completely invisible within our framework. Actually, m_R is this large because we chose the couplings d_ℓ close to one, in order to achieve the large tau-lepton branching ratios in table 2.[6] Thus, the effect that we want to produce in our model can only occur for a large seesaw scale—it disappears, at least in the case of the tau lepton, for small m_R.

6 Conclusions

It is now known, since the experimental observation of neutrino oscillations [15]—for reviews on the phenomenology of neutrino oscillations see for instance ref. [16], that there is lepton flavour-violation. However, that violation has not yet been observed in the charged-lepton sector and it is not quite certain where it is most likely to be observed

[5] It may readily be seen that, when in the matrix M_R of equation (44) one sets $e^{i\hat{\alpha}} = e^{i\hat{\beta}} = \mathbb{1}$ and $\cos\delta \pm 1$, the invariants $\det M_R$, $\text{tr}\, M_R$, and $\text{tr}\left(M_R^2\right)$ become independent of $\cos\delta$ when $d_\mu = d_\tau$ in Δ_1. Therefore, m_4, m_5, and m_6 are the same for both signs of $\cos\delta$.

[6] Note that if one uses $d_e = d_\mu = d_\tau = 0$ in the $A_{\ell_1\ell_2}$ of equation (30b), then only two subdominant terms, without v in the numerator, survive.

first. In this context, the radiative decays $\ell_1^\pm \to \ell_2^\pm \gamma$ seem the best guess, and decays of the form $\ell_1^\pm \to \ell_2^\pm \ell_2^\pm \ell_3^\mp$ may be an option as well.

In this paper we have demonstrated, through an explicit numerical example, that there is a class of models where the radiative decays in the paragraph above may be so suppressed as to be utterly invisible, yet any of the five decays of the form $\ell_1^\pm \to \ell_2^\pm \ell_3^\pm \ell_3^\mp$, or indeed—if one assumes some finetuning—all such five decays simultaneously, may be just around the corner.

Our class of models, first considered in ref. [1], has more than one Higgs doublets and three right-handed neutrino singlets. The crucial assumption is that the lepton flavours are conserved in the Yukawa couplings and broken only in the Majorana mass terms of the right-handed neutrinos; this assumption is field-theoretically consistent because those mass terms have dimension three while the Yukawa couplings have dimension four. As demonstrated in ref. [3], the effect mentioned in the previous paragraph occurs if the seesaw scale is much larger than all other scales in this class of models. In the present paper we have shown that there is a relevant simplification of the effective flavour-violating couplings of the neutral scalars, emerging at the one-loop level, when one uses the Higgs basis, *i.e.* the basis for the Higgs doublets wherein only one of them has nonzero VEV.

We have explicitly computed the branching ratios of the five decays $\ell_1^\pm \to \ell_2^\pm \ell_3^\pm \ell_3^\mp$ in the case of a two-Higgs-doublet model assuming that the first doublet ϕ_1 coincides with the Higgs doublet of the SM, *viz.* it does not mix with the second doublet. Moreover, we have employed several simplifying assumptions in order to reduce the parameter space of the model, and some finetuning in order to obtain all five branching ratios simultaneously close to their experimental limits.

Flavour-diagonal Yukawa coupling matrices have no straightforward implementation in the quark sector,[7] so one has to admit non-diagonal Yukawa couplings there and avoid excessive flavour-changing neutral interactions by finetuning. Thus there is an asymmetry between the quark and the lepton sector. This may seem ugly, but, as pointed out in this paper, the intriguing consequences for charged-lepton decays make a consideration of such a framework worthwhile.

Acknowledgements: E.H.A. is supported by the FWF Austrian Science Fund under the Doctoral Program W1252-N27 "Particles and Interactions." L.L. is supported by the FCT Portuguese Science Foundation through the projects CERN/FIS-NUC/0010/2015 and UID/FIS/00777/2013, which are partially funded by POCTI (FEDER), COMPETE, QREN, and the European Union.

[7] For an attempt in this direction see, however, ref. [17].

References

[1] L. Lavoura and W. Grimus, *Seesaw model with softly broken $L_e - L_\mu - L_\tau$*, JHEP **0009** (2000) 007 [hep-ph/0008020];
W. Grimus and L. Lavoura, *Softly broken lepton numbers and maximal neutrino mixing*, JHEP **0107** (2001) 045 [hep-ph/0105212];
W. Grimus and L. Lavoura, *Softly broken lepton numbers: An Approach to maximal neutrino mixing*, Acta Phys. Polon. B **32** (2001) 3719 [PoS HEP **2001** (2001) 197] [hep-ph/0110041].

[2] P. Minkowski, *$\mu \to e\gamma$ at a rate of one out of 10^9 muon decays?*, *Phys. Lett.* **67B** (1977) 421;
T. Yanagida, *Horizontal gauge symmetry and masses of neutrinos*, in *Proceedings of the workshop on unified theory and baryon number in the universe (Tsukuba, Japan, 1979)*, O. Sawata and A. Sugamoto eds., KEK report **79-18**, Tsukuba, 1979;
S.L. Glashow, *The future of elementary particle physics*, in *Quarks and leptons, proceedings of the advanced study institute (Cargèse, Corsica, 1979)*, M. Lévy *et al.* eds., Plenum, New York, 1980;
M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, *Complex spinors and unified theories*, in *Supergravity*, D.Z. Freedman and F. van Nieuwenhuizen eds., North Holland, Amsterdam, 1979;
R.N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanović, *Neutrino mass and spontaneous parity violation*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44** (1980) 912.

[3] W. Grimus and L. Lavoura, *Soft lepton flavor violation in a multi-Higgs-doublet seesaw model*, Phys. Rev. D **66** (2002) 014016 [hep-ph/0204070].

[4] A. M. Baldini *et al.* (MEG Collaboration), *Search for the lepton flavour violating decay $\mu^+ \to e^+\gamma$ with the full dataset of the MEG experiment*, Eur. Phys. J. C **76** (2016) 434 [arXiv:1606.05081 [hep-ex]].

[5] C. Patrignani *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *The Review of Particle Physics (2016)*, Chin. Phys. C **40** (2016) 100001.

[6] A. M. Baldini *et al.*, *MEG upgrade proposal*, arXiv:1301.7225 [physics.ins-det].

[7] A. Blondel *et al.*, *Research proposal for an experiment to search for the decay $\mu \to eee$*, arXiv:1301.6113 [physics.ins-det].

[8] W. Grimus, L. Lavoura, O. M. Ogreid, and P. Osland, *A precision constraint on multi-Higgs-doublet models*, J. Phys. G **35** (2008) 075001 [arXiv:0711.4022 [hep-ph]].

[9] T. Blum, A. Denig, I. Logashenko, E. de Rafael, B. Lee Roberts, T. Teubner, and G. Venanzoni, *The muon $(g-2)$ theory value: Present and future*, arXiv:1311.2198 [hep-ph].

[10] M. Lindner, M. Platscher, and F. S. Queiroz, *A call for new physics: The muon anomalous magnetic moment and lepton flavor violation*, arXiv:1610.06587 [hep-ph].

[11] M. Davier, A. Hoecker, B. Malaescu, and Z. Zhang, *Reevaluation of the hadronic contributions to the muon $g-2$ and to $\alpha(M_Z)$*, Eur. Phys. J. C **71** (2011) 1515 [Erratum: Eur. Phys. J. C **72** (2012) 1874] [arXiv:1010.4180 [hep-ph]].

[12] K. Hagiwara, R. Liao, A. D. Martin, D. Nomura, and T. Teubner, $(g-2)_\mu$ *and* $\alpha(M_Z^2)$ *re-evaluated using new precise data*, J. Phys. G **38** (2011) 085003 [arXiv:1105.3149 [hep-ph]].

[13] G. C. Branco, P. M. Ferreira, L. Lavoura, M. N. Rebelo, M. Sher, and J. P. Silva, *Theory and phenomenology of two-Higgs-doublet models*, Phys. Rept. **516** (2012) 1 [arXiv:1106.0034 [hep-ph]].

[14] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, and T. Schwetz, *Global analyses of neutrino oscillation experiments*, Nucl. Phys. B **908** (2016) 199 [arXiv:1512.06856 [hep-ph]].

[15] Y. Fukuda *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande Collaboration], *Evidence for oscillation of atmospheric neutrinos*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81** (1998) 1562 [hep-ex/9807003];
Q. R. Ahmad *et al.* [SNO Collaboration], *Measurement of the rate of* $\nu_e+d \to p+p+e^-$ *interactions produced by* ^8B *solar neutrinos at the Sudbury Neutrino Observatory*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** (2001) 071301 [nucl-ex/0106015];
B. Aharmim *et al.* [SNO Collaboration], *Combined analysis of all three phases of solar neutrino data from the Sudbury Neutrino Observatory*, Phys. Rev. C **88** (2013) 025501 [arXiv:1109.0763 [nucl-ex]].

[16] S. M. Bilenky and B. Pontecorvo, *Lepton mixing and neutrino oscillations*, Phys. Rept. **41** (1978) 225;
S. M. Bilenky and S. T. Petcov, *Massive neutrinos and neutrino oscillations*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **59** (1987) 671 [Errata: Rev. Mod. Phys. **60** (1988) 575 and Rev. Mod. Phys. **61** (1989) 169];
S. M. Bilenky, C. Giunti and W. Grimus, *Phenomenology of neutrino oscillations*, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **43** (1999) 1 [hep-ph/9812360].

[17] W. Grimus and L. Lavoura, *Quark mixing from softly broken symmetries*, JHEP **0405** (2004) 016 [hep-ph/0312330].